

Appl. No. 10/802,545

Response Dated March 13, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action Dated November 13, 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Please reconsider the application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-67 remain in this application. Independent Claims 1, 31, and 65-67 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments.

**Information Disclosure Statements**

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has considered the Information Disclosure Statement filed by Applicant on November 14, 2006.

**Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 102**

Claims 1-67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US20040149431 to Wylie. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Wylie fails to teach each of the limitations of the claimed invention and, therefore, fails to anticipate the claimed invention.

**A. Examiner Interview**

On March 5, 2007, Applicant held a teleconference with Examiner Kenneth Thompson to review the issues in this case. During that conversation, Inventor Daan Veeningen, Inventor Kris Givens and Attorney Jennie Salazar were present to describe the claimed invention and its differences from the cited art. The substance of the interview is provided in the information herein.

**B. Response to Examiner's Arguments**

The Examiner rejected Applicant's arguments as "not persuasive". *See Advisory Action PTO-202*. The Examiner further states that "Applicant argues the limitation 'generating a summary of a drillstring in each hole section of a wellbore in response to wellbore geometry inherently includes a summary of a wellbore section; and steering the drill assembly to extend

Appl. No. 10/802,545

Response Dated March 13, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action Dated November 13, 2006

casing lengths according to the well plan requires a summary of at least the position of said casing lengths in the drilled hole section.”

The claimed method relates to techniques involving well planning or generating drillstring design data. As described in paragraph 0002 of the published application, the subject matter of the present invention relates to techniques for providing automatic drill string design based on wellbore geometry and trajectory requirements. Such designing or planning is performed prior to the actual drilling process.

All independent claims have been amended to clarify that the planning or design involves “generating a summary of a drillstring-in for each hole section of a wellbore in response to said input data.” Support for this amendment is found in Figures 19A and 19B and text at paragraph 1263 of the published application. This amendment clarifies that the summary of the drill string is made for the section of the wellbore, rather than while in the wellbore. As depicted/described, a summary of a drillstring is generated for each hole section of a wellbore in response to said input data. This summary of the drillstring define items, such as the drillstring size, length of the drill pipe, size and weight of the heavy (HW) drill pipe, etc. (see paragraph 1263). Other features of the drill string for each hole section, such as the surface, intermediate and production sections, of the well are also provided as depicted in Fig. 19A.

Wylie fails to provide a method of well planning that involves generating a summary of the drill string. Wylie does not even contemplate generating a summary of a drillstring. As set forth in paragraph 167 of Wylie, Wylie focuses on real-time drilling techniques that occur in the wellbore. Such real-time drilling techniques relate to adjustments made in real-time during drilling, rather than defining a well plan or design prior to drilling. Moreover, Wyle fails to

Appl. No. 10/802,545

Response Dated March 13, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action Dated November 13, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

**MAR 13 2007**

appreciate the need to design the drillstring prior to drilling. Wylie, therefore, fails to even contemplate the well planning or designing techniques involving drillstring summaries as recited in Applicant's claims. Thus, Wylie fails to anticipate or render obvious the present claims.

**B. Additional Arguments**

Applicant further reasserts its arguments made in the previous responses filed on January 16, 2007 and September 18, 2006.

In view of the above, Wylie fails to anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention. Applicant, therefore, requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Applicant believes this reply to be fully responsive to all outstanding issues and place this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, do not hesitate to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

This paper is submitted in response to the Final Office Action dated November 13, 2006 (and Advisory Action dated February 12, 2007), for which the three-month date for response is February 13, 2007. A one month extension of time is hereby requested, bringing the date for response to March 13, 2007. Please apply any charges not covered or any credits, to Deposit Account 07-1078 (Reference Number 94.0076).

Appl. No. 10/802,545

Response Dated March 13, 2007

Reply to Final Office Action Dated November 13, 2006

Date: 3/13/07

Respectfully submitted,

Jennie J.L. Salazar, Reg. No. 45,065  
Intellectual Property Counsel  
Schlumberger Information Solutions  
5599 San Felipe, Suite 1208  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 513-3754  
Facsimile: (713) 513-2056